THEOLOGY

VOL. LVI MARCH, 1953 No. 393

Editorial

PROFESSOR C. H. DODD'S Stone Lectures delivered at Princeton Theological Seminary in 1950, which have now been published, are an important contribution to a question which is at present in the centre of theological interest—the relation between the New Testament and the Old Testament. Their title is *According to the Scriptures: the Sub-structure of New Testament Theology*,[1] and they are a kind of sequel to his well-known book *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments*. There he maintained, what has since become almost an axiom, that the New Testament amid all its variety has a common and central theme, namely the *kerygma*, or proclamation of the Gospel, which consists of the announcement of certain historical events in a setting which displays their significance. He likens the *kerygma* to the ground-plan or foundation of a building, and the different sections of New Testament literature to the several superstructures which are erected upon it and which exhibit a rich diversity of style. He now asks whether the various superstructures—especially the works of St Paul, of St John, and of the writer to the Hebrews—have anything in common beyond the bare outline of the *kerygma*. Have they a common substructure?

He finds the clue to the answer in the fact that the events which the Gospel announces are constantly said to be "according to the Scriptures" or to have happened "that the Scripture might be fulfilled". This leads him to a fresh examination of the quotations, direct and indirect, from the Old Testament in the New. He calls in question the widely accepted view that the New Testament writers had at their disposal one or more books of "Testimonies", or anthologies of proof-texts from the Old Testament, each text being isolated from its context. Through a detailed study of the passages actually quoted he reaches the conclusion that, before any such anthologies were made and before any of the New Testament writings took shape, certain substantial sections of the Old Testament had been selected by the Church on the ground that they provided a coherent interpretation of the work of Christ. This body of Old Testament material, of which the principal contents were passages from Isaiah, Jeremiah, certain minor prophets, and the Psalms, provided the starting-point for the theological constructions which we have in the New Testament.

Years ago F. C. Burkitt said that, while some of the proof-texts seem far-fetched, the argument from prophecy "is ultimately an attempt to show that the life and mission of Jesus was no divine freak or caprice, but part of a well-ordered whole". If Prof. Dodd is

[1] Nisbet. 10s. 6d.

right there is more to it than that, and some of the proof-texts are not so far-fetched as has been supposed. The argument of his book needs to be followed in detail if its force is to be appreciated, and if its important corollaries are to be perceived. Here is an excellent piece of Bible study for anyone to undertake during Lent, except that it is no sort of a penance!

* * * * *

The Bishop of Chichester's biography of Randall Davidson is one of the few books which will assuredly rank as standard works on the history of the Church of England. To the third edition, which has recently appeared,[1] the Bishop has contributed a new preface in which he discusses the differences that have come upon the office of Archbishop of Canterbury during the past century and especially during the past fifty years. He also raises once more the question whether there ought not to be at Lambeth a kind of G.H.Q. or curia, justly concluding that "no plan is likely to succeed which is not initiated, or at least heartily welcomed, by the Archbishop of Canterbury of the day".

The first edition of this book was reviewed in THEOLOGY, December, 1935, by Dr S. C. Carpenter.

The Rebuilding of the Temple and the Re-introduction of Sacrifice in the light of Rabbinical Judaism

SINCE the establishment of the Jewish state one can hear the question asked not infrequently what the Jews intend to do now about the rebuilding of the Temple for which they have so fervently prayed for almost two thousand years. The precariousness of the situation in Jerusalem adds a further interest to the question. Have the Jews any serious religious concern in possessing again the Old City and with it the Temple area? Are they really making any preparations to resume the old sacrificial ritual? It should be made quite clear at the very outset of this short survey that if these questions are raised at all, it is in Christian circles that they are raised. So far as the author knows the whole subject has never been discussed or mentioned in any Jewish or Israeli circle, not even at rabbinical gatherings or conferences, and he strongly suspects that the occupation of the Old City of Jerusalem by the Arab Legion must have come as a strong relief to the Israeli Chief Rabbinate, which was thus relieved of the embarrassing task of making an official pronouncement on the problem. The fact that the question is mainly asked by Christians implies that it is asked with a good deal of ignorance concerning the relevant factors. In itself there is nothing surprising in that, nor should it call for any reaction, were it not that very often the same ignorance that asks the question immediately presumes to answer it. It is with a view to

[1] *Randall Davidson*, by G. K. A. Bell. Oxford University Press. 45s.

acquainting the interested reader with the rabbinical background of the subject, and not with the purpose of taking part in a controversy that ought to remain strictly one of Jewish theology and rabbinical canon law, that the following lines are written.

We may, I think, distinguish between two reasons which have led to the raising of the question of the rebuilding of the Temple and the resumption of sacrifice. The one is a legitimate theological or general interest on the part of Christians in the present national and spiritual crisis of Judaism. Do Jews still feel their age-old aspirations to be essential to them and, if they do, what do they intend to do about it? The second reason is, however disguised, basically a political one. It tries to convey, unconsciously or surreptitiously, that the Jews must perforce be up to dark designs that would endanger the peace throughout the Arab world, that they could certainly not be entrusted with guardianship of the holy places, that they might blow up the Haram-esh-Sharif (the Mosque of Omar) to build their temple, etc. Whoever raises, therefore, the problem should at least be honest about his motives.

How does the problem really stand? In trying to describe it, we must distinguish three different aspects: 1. Political and social: Would any plan to renew Temple-worship be feasible to-day, not only with a view to reactions outside Israel but considering the attitude of Israelis themselves and of European and American Jewries? 2. Psychological and religious: What line would be taken—not by Jewry generally but, more specifically, by religious Jews? Does sacrifice and Temple-worship still appeal to them emotionally or does it constitute a desirable religious end in their eyes? 3. Rabbinic law: How does the *Halakhah* (talmudical-rabbinic law) envisage this problem? It is our purpose to concentrate on the third of these aspects, mainly with a view to giving the reader an idea of the way in which this and suchlike problems are handled in rabbinic *Halakhah*. Nevertheless, a few words must be said of the first two as well.

1. *Political and Social.*—It is a well-known fact that the great majority of Jews in Israel are non-religious. Of this majority again a large part is definitely anti-religious. The religious parties have the greatest trouble to secure fulfilment of their minimum demands such as public observance of the Sabbath, the import of *kasher* (ritually permitted) meat, religious education for immigrant children, etc. Even so, the seemingly most harmless attempts to secure some sort of traditional-religious character to public life are decried as rabbinical totalitarianism, orthodox tyranny, clericalism, medieval obscurantism, and the like. Even if the religious parties and the rabbis should decide that sacrificial ritual ought to be resumed (and we shall see in the following paragraphs that they are very far from doing so), the realization of this desire would be an impossibility. Not only because the Israelis are too level-headed to risk a flare-up of Moslem fanaticism or the displeasure of the United Nations, but mainly because the majority of Israeli citizens would fight this rabbinical atavism and cannibalism tooth and nail.

2. *Psychological and Religious.*—The above considerations have

been written without any special qualification. They are the mere impression of an observer of the political scene, and other observers of that political scene may arrive at different conclusions. But when we turn from the anti-religious or non-religious majority of Israel to the religious groups, who might reasonably be expected to entertain projects concerning Temple and sacrifice, we seem to be on safer ground. We should note first the historical fact that since the cessation of sacrifice in A.D. 70 the Jews seem to have lost slowly their inner, vital contact with sacrificial ritual. The most remarkable thing about the offer of Julian the Apostate to rebuild the Temple was the utter absence of response from the Jews. This can, of course, be partly attributed to the complete exhaustion of the Jewish people after terrible wars and abortive risings. For some centuries indeed the hope that "to-morrow God might rebuild the Sanctuary" was still very real, and discussions concerning the *minutiae* of ritual were conducted with all the learning and ingenuity of which the rabbis of the Talmud were capable. A whole section of the *Mishnah* with the corresponding Babylonian *Gemara* is devoted to the subject. The results of their controversies are embodied in book nine (*Abodah*) of the Code of Maimonides (twelfth century. We shall refer to it as Cod. Maim.). Not a single detail is left out in that monumental work: the prescribed measurements and topographical and architectural lay-out of the Temple buildings, courts, halls, rooms, etc.; the exact description of altars, vessels, sacerdotal vestments, and ritual instruments; the qualifications for (and disqualification from) the ministry of priests; rules concerning access to the Temple precincts; rules concerning which animals may or may not be sacrificed; the manner and ritual of the various public and private sacrifices, offerings, and services. Post-exilic Jewish liturgy too tended to assign a central part to the memory of past sacrifices and to the prayer for their renewal. Prayer was, in fact, often referred to as a "substitute" only for the Temple-ritual.

But all this cannot blind us to the fact that in course of time the inner contact was lost. The liturgy dates to a large extent from the period immediately following the destruction of the Temple, and so does the Mishnah. Maimonides codified only the material which he found spread unsystematically throughout the talmudic writings. And the same Maimonides, in his great philosophical work *Moreh*, said some very startling things about sacrifice which, if taken seriously, would render much of the legislation in his code obsolete. Religious sensitivity somehow ceased to see in the ritual of sacrifice an adequate symbol for its aspirations. In modern Judaism this crisis has come to a head. Non-orthodox religious Judaism (liberal, reform, progressive, or however called) has struck out all references in the liturgy to the reinstitution of sacrifices. They evidently felt they could not honestly pray for something which they emphatically resented and would not wish to see renewed. More interesting still, even orthodox Jews, when pressed hard on the point, usually admit that they are rather at a loss to know what they would do with sacrifices. If they still adhere, for dogmatic reasons, to the belief in a

future renewal of temple-ritual, they do so in the hope and expectation that when the Messiah will come mankind will also be given a "new heart"—which means a different religious sensitivity and a different pattern of psychological reaction. It is by this *tour de force* of faith only that they seem able to adhere to a whole-hearted affirmation of renewed sacrificial worship.

The upshot seems to be that even where the old belief survives it is held for dogmatic reasons and without particular enthusiasm. This situation need not, however, be taken as a symptom of weakness or loss of religious vitality. It shows only that sacrifice has lost its central role in Jewish worship and theology. The two thousand years of exile taught Jews to live without temple and priest. They were prepared for this lesson by the Prophets and by the great "dress-rehearsal" for their long exile: in the first, the Babylonian exile, they already began to substitute the Synagogue for the Temple. The Hebrew word *korban* does not actually mean "sacrifice". It signifies "that which is brought nigh" to God. Through the Prophets, the Pharisees, the Rabbis, and kabbalistic mysticism, Judaism has to a large extent lost the inner need for that external ritual which the Temple-worship would provide; it has learned other ways of bringing self and the world nearer to God. Consequently, if some orthodox Jews still hope for the reintroduction of sacrifice, they no longer do so because they consider it the essential rite of Jewish religion, but rather because it seems to them a divinely instituted and very appropriate symbolic representation of Israel's central idea: to bring self and the world nearer to God.

Before passing on to the next section, it may be useful in this connexion to point to one particular difference in sacrificial notions between Judaism and Christianity, in their relation to prophetic teaching. Whether the Prophets' opposition to the priestly rituals ought to be interpreted as uncompromising condemnation or only as a protest against the mechanical, externalized abuses of it is irrelevant for our present purpose. The point is that the Prophets preferred no sacrifice at all to one which would be considered an effective ritual independent of man's practical, moral life. In other words, what they condemned was the idea of sacrifice as a sacramental means of grace. It is precisely this conception which was taken up again by the Church both in (some versions of) her Christology and in (some versions of) her doctrine of the Mass. With a view to the traditional claim that the Church is more in the line of prophetic teaching, as against the reputedly more legalistic character of the pharisaic and rabbinic traditions, this point deserves mention and closer inquiry.

3. *Rabbinic Law.*—Let us now consider an extreme case. Let us assume there was politically no difficulty in rebuilding the Temple, that the non-religious Jews would not object, that the religious Jews would wish it, and that the orthodox rabbis were given a free hand to realize the desire of their hearts and of their prayers. What exactly would they do?

Mention has already been made of the peculiar reticence and reluctance characteristic of Judaism in this matter. After the destruc-

tion of the Temple, popular legend (*Aggadah*) began to embroider with luxuriant imagination the prophetic promises and pictures of future glory, and provided highly imaginative and detailed descriptions of the miracles to be wrought at the final redemption, when God himself would build the new Temple out of fire. Unlike the first two temples which were both the work of man's hands and therefore were also both destroyed by men, the third sanctuary would be eternal because built by God. To the extent that this aggadic material had any halakhic relevance, it tended to question man's right to presume to do himself that which should be left to God, particularly since the stability and redemptive quality of the new sanctuary resided exactly in the fact that it was God who intervened. If the new altar had to descend miraculously from heaven, it would be blasphemous for man to set it up himself. This point was actually discussed in the nineteenth century between Chief Rabbi Nathan Adler and the German Rabbi Tsevi Hirsh Kalischer. In fact, Rabbi Kalischer was the only one ever seriously to raise the question of Temple and Sacrifice, and most of the halakhic pros and cons on the subject are to be found in his writings and in the answers of those who disagreed with him (practically all).[1]

But let us assume this obstacle to have been cleared. The next objection to be advanced is the following: exact measurements and topographical details of the Temple-courts, halls, altars, etc., are given by the Talmud and in the Cod. Maim. Their precise interpretation, however, is unknown to us. We cannot, therefore, rebuild the Temple. On the other hand, it can be held that sacrifices, though they must be brought on the traditional site of the Temple (this is the halakhic terminus of the old battle between the Jerusalem-sanctuary and the "high places"), do not require the actual existence of Temple and altar. Maimonides, in fact (Cod. Maim., *Beth Habbehirah* vi. 15), rules that sacrifices can be offered even without Temple. Knowledge and, obviously, possession of the site is sufficient for the performance of the ritual.

Here, however, a new difficulty arises. The Temple area may be approached only in a state of levitical purity. In case of serious levitical defilement (which is held to be the case to-day: practically everybody has at one time or another been in contact with a dead body or passed a cemetery) the purification ceremony includes sprinkling with water containing the ash of a red heifer (see *Numbers* 19). This rite has fallen into desuetude and can hardly be renewed to-day for legal considerations that will be evident soon. It is a well-known fact that orthodox Jews never visited the Haram-esh-Sharif, even during the times when Muslims allowed Jewish tourists to visit the place, as this would have involved them in mortal sin. The site is therefore, halakhically, inaccessible.

There are authorities which have challenged this ruling, e.g. Maimonides' opponent "Rabed" (cf. Cod. Maim., *Beth Habbehirah* vi. 14, and Rabed *ad loc.*). They maintain that with the destruction

[1] Cf. R. Tsevi Hirsh Kalischer, *Derishath Zion*, and R. David Friedman of Karlin, *Responsa Sheeloth David*.

of the Temple all sanctity vanished from the site and that, consequently, the various prohibitions are no longer in force. More exactly: the dedication of the Temple and of its site was meant to cover *only* the period of its existence. Therefore the site *is* legally accessible now. When God will build the third Temple he will invest it with a new and everlasting holiness. As against this Maimonides contends that the sanctity of the second Temple did not vanish from the site and that to visit it to-day is mortal sin.

But even if we take the Rabed's view and hold the site of the Temple to be accessible, other problems still need to be solved. For levitical purity is a *conditio sine qua non* not only for access to the Temple (we have just disposed of this difficulty—for the sake of argument—according to Rabed) but for the performance of any levitical or priestly function whatsoever. Nobody could therefore offer the sacrifice or perform any of the prescribed rites. This difficulty is again provided for by a talmudic rule which lays down that public sacrifices (such as the regular daily morning and evening burnt-offering, feast-day offerings, etc., as against private voluntary offerings, sin-offerings, etc.) suspend the rules of levitical defilement. In that case even priests in a state of defilement may minister and similarly Israelites enter the Temple-courts.

This is not yet the end. For the regulations governing the collection of the funds out of which the public offerings are provided are not satisfied by present conditions. The only offering that would escape this objection is the Passover-lamb, which has legally the character of a public offering and which is yet brought by every family separately, i.e. from private means. It would therefore seem that the whole controversy is in the last resort all about one offering in the whole year only.

Moreover, there are the descriptions of the priestly vestments as given in *Exodus* 28 and elaborated in the Talmud. For a variety of reasons, one of which is our ignorance about the exact nature of the materials, colours, etc., referred to, we could not possibly make these vestments, and the priests are therefore unable to minister. On the other hand, it can be argued that the ritual indeed requires these vestments but is not contingent on them.

A further grave problem is that of the status of the priesthood itself. According to the *Halakhah* the rites can be validly performed only by "the priests the sons of Aaron". Whether such a thing ever existed, speaking strictly historically, is not our concern at present. It is not our present views on the origin of the Jewish priesthood which are at issue here, but the traditional rabbinical ideas about it. The contention is that there was an unbroken line of direct descent, not an apostolic but a "biological" succession as it were, which somehow got lost in the first centuries of our era. There are traditions of priesthood among many families and these are accepted as far as present-day synagogue ceremonial is concerned. But they do not possess that character of evidence which would be required to qualify for ministering in the sacrificial ritual. The argument on the other side would, of course, try to show that the implicit belief in the

family traditions that is accorded for the purpose of synagogue ceremonial could also be extended to the Temple.

The above summary of halakhic controversy and argumentation may appear abstruse and strange. Yet it may give the general reader an idea of the manner in which orthodox rabbinical Judaism approaches a problem of this kind. The theologian and student of ecclesiastical law will not even find it abstruse or strange. He will only find it "a bit different". Taking everything together, it seems significant that in the whole course of Jewish history, with so many pious Rabbis settling in the Holy Land, the question should not have been raised more often. So far as the writer is aware, only one of the Tossafist rabbis (thirteenth century) ever announced his intention to sacrifice the Passover-lamb in Jerusalem. But the opposition from his colleagues to this "revolutionary" idea was so great that to avoid scandal on the one hand and, on the other hand, to be at peace with his conscience, he chose, on arriving in Palestine, to stay away from Jerusalem. In the nineteenth century the aforementioned Rabbi Tsevi Hirsh Kalischer, one of the precursors of religious Zionism, was an ardent advocate of the idea of the renewal of sacrifice. But he was playing a lone hand and practically all the rabbinical authorities of his day disagreed and advanced the objections mentioned above.

One conclusion seems to emerge from all this legal ingenuity. Sacrifice, even among the orthodox, does not, at the moment, play any dynamic role in Jewish religion. It is neither a consuming wish nor an inspiring ideal. It is in no way the great vision, the realization of which would crown the political achievement of the Jewish state. One would have expected more *élan* and enthusiasm in a matter which in Bible and liturgy is so heavily charged with significance. Instead of enthusiasm one finds a hesitating reluctance which expresses itself in ingenious legal argumentation. This is, psychologically speaking, the way one deals with secondary, marginal issues, not with the core and heart of one's religious aspiration. In such cases one rather suspects the arguments to be not "reasons" but "rationalizations" and symptoms of volitional attitudes. Many an Anglican may have had similar feelings with regard to the Roman arguments concerning the validity of Anglican orders.

Our conclusion therefore is that halakhic opinion is, to say the least, not such as to encourage the rebuilding of the Temple and the resumption of sacrifice. The orthodox rabbinical attitude is one of extreme reluctance, the liberal one is definitely negative. The biblical and liturgical texts may still have significance as imagery or as historical or symbolical utterances, but for all practical purposes, sacrificial ritual appears to have ceased, at present, to be a central and dynamic Jewish aspiration.

R. J. Zwi Werblowsky.

Three more Wiltshire Parsons, 1896-1951[1]

ARTHUR PHILIP MORRES, pastor, antiquarian, naturalist, friend of Kilvert the diarist, was succeeded in the vicarage of Britford by *Thomas John Woodall* (1896–1929). His *name* will be unknown to the great world; his *type* is the theme of many a novel—the ideal country parson. For such he was, as the bare facts will demonstrate and local memories amply confirm. Born at Caerwent, Monmouth, he passed his boyhood on his father's farm in Somerset, and, with no more academic training than a brief spell at Salisbury Theological College, he served three curacies—the first was at Sixpenny Handley in far Dorset—and came to Britford as vicar and chaplain to the Earl of Radnor and to the Alderbury Union. He left only on his retirement to the Close in 1929 and there he died in 1941. His mortal remains lie in a corner of the churchyard where once the legions marched along the sunken road to the ford across the Avon on their way to Old Sarum. He married a lady of the parish somewhat late in life—there were three children, and of the two boys one died at seven; the other is now in holy orders. Recognition of steady pastoral and social work brought opportunity for wider influence—the secretaryship of the diocesan Board of Education, the presidency of the Poor Law Officers' Association in Wilts., and in 1923 an honorary prebend in Salisbury Cathedral. Neither prophet nor scholar, his were the virtues of the pastoral temperament applied to the old order in rural England on its way out. The rule was firm but kind, the parochial routine maintained its simplicity and informality, the labouring poor were visited and assisted, the respectable classes stimulated or placated. "Solidity of labour", to use the Gladstonian terminology, reinforced by kindliness and shrewdness, marked a long and successful incumbency; only towards the end, after World War I, when reformist legislation imposed new duties involving a fresh approach to parochial administration, do the registers reveal signs of reluctance or inability to adapt mind and method to changing times. So far is nothing abnormal or unusual; probably in the majority of the parishes of this county and diocese the same steadfast solidity of labour and length of tenure marked the beginning, continuance, and end of contemporary incumbents.

But *Crockford* cannot tell all the tale of even the most uneventful career, and Woodall if an excellent specimen of a type was also a man of marked individuality. There are still some half-dozen parishioners who can recall him in the years of his strength and vigour. He was, they will tell you, "a fine figure of a man" or "a magnificent specimen of manhood". "And couldn't he pitch", adds the farmer as he recalls the vicar's exploits at hay harvest in the lush water-meadows. Or "What he didn't know about birds and flowers weren't worth knowing". Never to be forgotten were the expeditions when the vicar took the boys to catch adders—apparently by means of a red flannel bag tied to the end of a stick which they bit and could

[1] See THEOLOGY, September 1951, pp. 329–35.

not let go; they were shaken off into a sack and sent to the laboratories at Bristol. The clue to another recollection continues to escape me—or if there is no clue then the memory itself might be worth a place in the psychologist's case book. "When Canon Woodall took tea with us he would never allow mother to pour out the grouts —now why was that?" I have no idea. Even the vicar's jobbing gardeners seen through the haze of distance seem to have shared their master's strength and skill and craft. What labour and intelligence they gave, and for how meagre a recompense! What exploits were theirs in kitchen garden and greenhouse and border! The large lawn, nowadays amenable only to a motor mower, was cut and trimmed weekly for one shilling or eighteen pence. Indeed, the industry, versatility, resource, and fortitude of this class of men are a part of parish history too often overlooked even by the social historian, perhaps because the evidence does not lurk in archives. *Arma virumque cano* indeed! One doubts if any exploit of Aeneas better deserves record than the true story of old Joe Webb, who died only in 1948. Late one night when stoking the vicarage boiler he discovered that the farmer's bull was loose in the neighbouring rickyard and not apparently in a good humour. Webb, however, took it upon himself to persuade the rampant monster to permit himself to be taken back to the stall and secured for the night. And this near midnight with all the world asleep and no help near! The neighbourly deed was done and no one would have been the wiser but that the farmer's wife awoke when the stall door shut on the captive bull. What poise, assurance, pluck. Mr Webb's daughter still finds time to assist at the vicarage; her contribution to these reminiscences shall be the fact that to the end, when in retirement in the Close, Canon Woodall continued "very partial" to seeded doughcake—a human touch calculated to stir the heart of every Wiltshireman over fifty, doughcake then and now being two very different things.

John Bell Jackson took orders after a career in his father's office in Fenchurch Street, E.C.; he once acted as his father's election agent when Jackson *père* fought Lord Hugh Cecil for the representation of Greenwich. Another distinction is his: he is the brother of William Jackson, the blind missionary of Burma whose name and exploits can never be too often remembered. So like Woodall, John Bell came to Britford after terms at Sarum College, three curacies, and a hospital chaplaincy. As he says, "For a Cockney of fifty years to succeed a country born and bred incumbent with a record of thirty-five years' devoted work in the parish was no light task." Yet by devotion, energy, system, those disadvantages were overcome, and in ten years the Cockney won the co-operation and affection of his rural flock even though a tiny minority found it hard to forgive him for "letting the garden go". But if not a naturalist or horticulturist, he was (and is) something of an antiquarian and researcher both caring meticulously for the fabric of the Saxon church and collecting assiduously every item of information relating to the parish over a very wide field. Indeed, his friend and successor makes bold to say Jackson's

talents were never fully drawn upon, and while he was happy and successful here the possible dividends were never so high as they would have been in a more congenial field of labour. Topographically the parish would be a strain to the strongest man possessing neither bicycle nor car, and a terrific thunderstorm on July 2, 1938, which brought down the medieval cross on the west gable, gave a serious jolt to the vicar's health. He resigned after illness in the following spring.

Of his own incumbency—as of those through several centuries—he has codified ample material for the chronicler; it is hard to refrain from quotation for the wise historian never despises trivialities—what would we not give for a scrap of the diary of Osbert the Presbyter at the time when the Domesday surveyor came round? Thus, visits, official or otherwise, are recorded—one of St Clair Donaldson shortly before his sudden death at the Palace (1935) and of Winnington Ingram, who paid an almost annual visit to the many streams of the Avon then (but not now) abounding in home-bred trout. Less distinguished fishermen came and there was no lack of trout and grayling at the vicarage and pleasant conversation at the Fishing Lodge. All that with other amenities now belongs to a past which will never return. In 1936 the Parish Council, of which Jackson was chairman, secured a monthly collection of débris—the import of which will be apparent to those who have noted in this tin-can age the rapid growth of unofficial dumps in quarry and copse. Sociological also we may call Jackson's reminiscence of the Salisbury Fire Brigade arriving post-haste one Saturday afternoon, some wayfarer having seen smoke pouring from the tower when as usual the sexton had stoked the boiler. Or of the small boy in the school—surely an incipient anti-bureaucrat—who noted a day when the school had been visited by the vicar, by the doctor, by the dentist, the nurse, the attendance officer, and at last uttered his expostulation, "How many more o' ye?" And finally, they whose duty it is to stir up the English laity to more systematic giving may make what use they care of Jackson's record of an interchange with an old roadman now deceased but well known only a few years ago. "Do ee know why I don't go to church, vicar? Cos Mr Morres started they collections in church in 1880 I think 'twere and I told ee I wouldna go agin; there were too much bag in my feace." How obvious are the advantages of a compulsory church rate! The roadman's date is correct; the rate was in this parish abolished in 1880 and an "offertory" substituted. Parliament, we know, had made the change inevitable; the irony in this instance is that the transition to a higher and nobler level of finance was one result of a Parochial Mission! The statistician may like to learn that the voluntary system produced for the first decade (1880–90) £40 annually; in 1930, £80; in 1950, £150—amounts which covered the ordinary running expenses.

There are of course always extraordinary expenses. Both these incumbencies saw the continual addition of interior furnishment, some beautiful, some—to later taste—regrettable. In Woodall's time almost every window became a memorial window. The bier was given in

memory of Tom Harris, clerk and sexton for twenty-six years, who had begun his ecclesiastical career as a choir boy at Hursley under John Keble. As to the fabric, the tower was conservatively restored in 1903. The modest but commodious Memorial Hall (1922) cost but £750 in cash since parishioners gave freely of toil and transport. The architect thereof was Leonard Harris, the estate manager, one of those stalwart backers-up of successive vicars who are the salt of the rural parish. He died of heart failure in the lane only a year ago. To these works of restoration and embellishment Jackson added so well that there was little for his successor to provide in the way of *instrumenta ecclesiastica*—frontals, stoles, cruets, hassocks. But the researcher notices that while Woodall's works were financed in the main by outright gifts of individual benefactors, the later generation relied largely on the social, the whist-drive, and the jumble sale. These instruments of low finance are themselves nowadays, at least in this parish, proving unsuitable to a new age. On the emergence of a crisis in 1946 owing to the depredations of the beetles in the roof timbers, the large sum required was given freely and directly; so, too, was the cost of the installation of electricity in 1950. As for the official residence, a grateful successor notes that Jackson's improvements to the parsonage include an excellent bathroom. (Down to 1929 all water, hot or cold, was carried up the back stairs.) He was less successful in his repeated attempts to banish damp from the maid's bedroom—a problem which has beaten more than one diocesan surveyor. It is an instance of how problems solve themselves if left alone. For in the Welfare State there are no maids for the driest and sunniest room. Most of them have turned away from any apprenticeship to the domestic arts and crafts and reach matrimony after five or six years as a copy-typist or assistant in a departmental store.

There are obvious reasons for brevity in referring to the present incumbent of the parish who came in 1939. Inferior to T. J. Woodall in country lore and craft, and to J. B. Jackson in devoutness of spirit, he has scored at some few points where one or other of them failed. As against Woodall his sermons are shorter and he has thus acquired merit at the Union chapel; as against Jackson he is a moderately skilled gardener and thus retains the amused tolerance of his rural parishioners for whom neglect here is the unforgivable sin. Were this an essay in autobiography the writer might hazard the suggestion that a kindly judgment upon the last twelve years might be, "Jack of all trades, master of none." The suggestion is made with an altruistic eye on any about-to-be rural incumbent who little dreams of the pitfalls awaiting him. Let him never forget that versatility can be a snare and adaptability a very mixed blessing. The country parson should pray to overcome his faults—and with equal fervour that he may overcome his virtues, at least those of the commercial or military or professional order. Let us perhaps put it, that a certain carelessness, born of imperturbable equanimity, is an essential ingredient in the moral make-up of the country incumbent. It is better

to relax with Mary than to wax contentious with Martha however justifiable the indignation. Conscientiousness must be diluted with kindliness and restrained by understanding; there is a wisdom of the heart. Yet perhaps when all is said one man is as good as another—save of course in those rare instances where he is completely out of communion with the general body of his parishioners. Despite the wide "differences of administration", the three incumbencies here under review seem to manifest an equality of result—the duties have been fulfilled, the sacraments administered, the sermons preached, the sick visited, the fabric preserved and embellished, the roll revised, and the quota paid in full. The congregations indeed have declined seriously since 1920, but that is accounted for by causes outside the control of any incumbent. The statistics here given suggest that the personal equation amounts to little; the last three columns all demonstrate, except for marriages, the decline since the opening of the century:

Total of—	*1900–9*	*1920–9*	*1930–9*	*1940–9*
Baptisms	90	60	79	77
Marriages	38	39	37	30
Burials	81	63	67	65
Confirmations ...	72	44	34	21

The fall in confirmations is accounted for by the fact that the Guardians of the Poor began to board out their young charges in the 'thirties, thus cutting off a convenient source of supply for Sunday school and choir. It is a loss unlikely to be made good. A Sunday school, at 10 a.m., reinforced by evacuees during 1939–45, declined to extinction when they returned home. The day school is now under sentence of death, there being only ten on the register since the few elder scholars now pass on to a senior school. Instead of crowded or overcrowded cottages it is difficult to find more than two children in a household, and at fifteen or sixteen the few adolescents, instead of finding employment in domestic service or on the farm, migrate to the neighbouring city. All this is too familiar to need elaboration. The pace of the change has quickened over the last five years. The national post-war social revolution, conjoined with some circumstances peculiar to this parish, is rapidly bringing to an end another chapter in a tale that began when Celt and Saxon made Britford a place of truce before the next surge forward.

The Saxon nave dates from about A.D. 850—eleven centuries. And now the tale seems reaching its last chapter. Our survey which began with Robert Morres arriving in 1796 looks more like the ending of a volume than just another instalment of a serial. Having survived for a thousand years wars and revolutions, plagues and pestilences, this particular village-community appears to be succumbing to stagnation, decay, and the insidious advance of local government reform. A few more years and Britford, like Milford and Fisherton and Bemerton and Harnham, will be enclosed within the municipal boundary. Already the marks of a true communal unit, both cus-

tomary and peculiar, begin to disappear. The famous Moat House where King Edward rested and whence Harold set forth for Hastings is divided into four flats with four separate households; Kilvert's "little manor" where he heard the prayer-bell from the Bishop's Palace is now partly occupied by a Polish agricultural labourer; the ancient smithy has been turned into two furnished dwellings rented by absentee army officers; the one remaining inn on the village green is now a bakery; two farms or three are held by non-resident tenants with plenty of capital; most of the cottages were long ago condemned but are still inhabited because of new houses we have only the promise; even the medieval sheep fair, out of which the labourer reckoned to make his year's rent, has been removed to Wilton. The school, built by Squire Jervoise in 1846 and for long supported by squire, vicar, and five farmers, and which fifty years ago was the scene of the labours of some eighty children and three mistresses, is destined to close next year; and finally, the ecclesiastical parish is scheduled to be divided into two parts and given to adjacent parishes on north and south; the present incumbent is in fact the last resident vicar of Britford.

Hence one impulse to this valedictory footnote. As the last lines are written the bells from the nearby tower with their elusive evocation of the distant past cease abruptly and the silence falls as it has fallen century by century on the lives and labours and pleasures of priests and peasants, thane and lord and squire and farmer. . . . Then, since silence is unacceptable to the young, a knob turns, and from London's Guildhall comes a not unfamiliar voice enunciating as it happens a not irrelevant truism: "It is only by studying the past that we can foresee however dimly or partially the future. It may well be that it is only by respecting the past that we can be worthy of the future."

W. G. Addison.

Great Pastors—III. Huldreich Zwingli

In the autumn of 1506 the parish of Glarus in Switzerland was awaiting the arrival of its new Rector, or "Kilchher" as he was officially styled.[1] In spite of pressure to institute Heinrich Göldli, a notorious pluralist,[2] the citizens of Glarus had insisted upon making their own choice, and they had appointed a young man who had only recently completed his university course, and had still to be ordained both deacon and priest.[3] Yet he was not altogether a stranger in Glarus, for his uncle was the well-known Dean of nearby Weesen—he possibly had a hand in the appointment—and although his studies had taken him to Berne, Vienna, and Basel, he himself came from a well-to-do peasant family in the Toggenburg[4] and had learned his first letters in Weesen. His name was Huldreich Zwingli.

With a view to taking up his new office Zwingli was ordained priest

[1] O. Farner, *Huldrych Zwingli*, II, p. 19. [2] Ibid., I, p. 243.
[3] Ibid., I, p. 243. [4] Ibid., I, pp. 31 f.

by the Bishop of Constance at the Michaelmas ordination (probably September 14), and he preached a first sermon at Rapperswyl and on September 29 celebrated his first mass at his own native village of Wildhaus in the Toggenburg.[1] He had already taken up residence in Glarus on the 21st, and he returned at once to give himself to his new ministry. The charge was an important one, for in addition to the township of Glarus it included several surrounding villages, with a total population of between one and two thousand.[2] At least two, and probably more assistant priests, or chaplains, were necessary to maintain the full round of spiritual ministration.[3] It was in this setting, then, that Zwingli first exercised his ministry, and for the next ten years, with the exception of the periods spent as a military chaplain in Italy, his life was the busy one of an ordinary parish priest. Indeed, even when he left Glarus for Einsiedeln, and later Zürich, he was never completely outside the office and responsibility of a pastor. And he was never a pluralist or non-resident, apart from the short intermediate period at Einsiedeln, when the people of Glarus would not release him from his primary charge.

What kind of a priest and pastor did he make? By all accounts, both at Glarus and later at Zürich, a very good one, and that in spite and perhaps because of his wide range of theological and political interests. A first and obvious reason for his success was his natural openness and friendliness of disposition, which made him the personal friend as well as the spiritual teacher of the families which he visited.[4] Superficially, the career of Zwingli might easily suggest that although he was sincere and clever he was also hard and uncompromising. Yet this was not at all the truth. His contemporaries were all struck by his frank and engaging manner. He was on the best of terms with his ecclesiastical superiors,[5] and, so far as is known, the neighbouring clergy.[6] He quickly won the affections of his people.[7] At a later date he genuinely desired fellowship with the Lutherans. If he was hated by those whom he opposed on principle, and if he himself had some hard words to say about them, he seldom bore any ill will towards individuals. Perhaps the best test is that he was loved as well as admired by his chaplains.[8]

Yet although a friendly disposition is a help, the pastoral office demands a good deal more, and Zwingli had a good deal more to give. From the very first he was interested in the possibilities opened out by preaching.[9] In his native tongue he had the gift of a homely and graphic style, and he had a fund of popular sayings and illustrations to drive home his points.[10] Nor was he afraid to be topical, relating his message directly to contemporary needs and situations. Even when he had not come to his evangelical understanding Zwingli laboured to acquire the technique of preaching.[11] Again, his constant reading helped him to keep his mind alert and well stocked, for to his houses at Glarus and Einsiedeln there came continual packages of

[1] Farner, op. cit., I, pp. 244–5. [2] Ibid., II, pp. 19–20. [3] Ibid., II, pp. 33 f.
[4] Ibid., II, pp. 21 f. [5] S. M. Jackson, *Ulrich Zwingli*, pp. 109–110.
[6] Farner, op. cit., II, 41. [7] Ibid., II, pp. 21 f. [8] Ibid., II, pp. 33 f.
[9] Ibid., II, pp. 41 f. [10] Ibid., I, pp. 96 f. [11] Jackson, op. cit., p. 89.

books, especially from his friends in Basel where the printing presses were very busy at this period.[1] Zwingli's greatest days as a preacher were undoubtedly at the Great Minster in Zürich, when he applied his technique to the systematic exposition of Holy Scripture,[2] and his sermons acquired a new solidarity and permanence of content, but already at Glarus he had mastered much of the external art of preaching.

Like many great pastors, Zwingli was a "doctor" as well as a preacher. At school and university he had been fired by the ideals of the Humanists,[3] and during his final years at Basel he had had some experience as a teacher at the St Martin's school.[4] It is hardly surprising, then, that to each of his charges Zwingli came as an educator as well as a spiritual mentor. At Glarus he quickly gathered around him a group of the more promising youngsters, to all of whom he gave instruction, advice, and a warm friendship.[5] In the later period at Zürich he was able to develop his ideas in the reform of the Minster school, which led to the formation not merely of a grammar school, but of a theological seminary, in which ministers and intending ministers could be instructed in Greek and Hebrew, and in Bible knowledge.[6] Zwingli was always an enthusiastic learner as well as a teacher. His Greek was self-taught,[7] and he had to begin Hebrew several times before he finally mastered it in Zürich.[8] At a later stage the educational interest tended perhaps to become more practical: to supply an educated ministry and to instruct the people against discarded errors; but Zwingli was always enough of the Humanist to accept the value of education as such, and at Glarus he had no thought of using his influence as a teacher merely for subversive ends.

It must be emphasized, however, that the academic interests of Zwingli never blinded him to the everyday needs and activities of his flock. At many points we can see how his warmth and humanity led him to that identification with his people which is the mark of a true pastor. We can see it in the readiness with which he participated in local and national festivities.[9] We can see it, too, in his ministrations to the parents of a boy who was drowned in the river Lint,[10] and especially to the parents and widows of the many men of Glarus who fell in the Italian campaigns.[11] We can see it in the way in which he accompanied the Glarus contingents to Italy as their military chaplain. We can see it during the plague at Zürich, when he stayed manfully at his post, giving such help as he could, and undermining his own health in consequence.[12] We can see it finally in the fatal expedition to Cappel, when he went to his death, not as a hard-boiled militarist, as the accounts and portraits sometimes suggest, but as a leader who was committed by a policy of sanc-

[1] Farner, op. cit., II, pp. 107 f. [2] Jackson, op. cit., pp. 122–3.
[3] Farner, op. cit., I, pp. 152 f. [4] Ibid., I, p. 195.
[5] Ibid., II, pp. 22 f.; 58 f. [6] Jackson, op. cit., p. 200; 269; 293.
[7] Ibid., pp. 81–2; Farner, op. cit., II, pp. 236–7. [8] Jackson, op. cit., p. 135; 150. [9] Farner, op. cit., II, pp. 25–26. [10] Ibid., II, p. 24.
[11] Ibid., II, p. 25. [12] Jackson, op. cit., pp. 130 f.

tions whose futility he had clearly foreseen, and who had had definite premonitions of the disaster which awaited both himself and his people.[1]

But if Zwingli identified himself with his people, he was always ahead of his people in his awareness of religious issues. A first problem was that of mercenary service. Like many others, Zwingli had condemned the mercenary system except as it applied to the Papacy.[2] But during the Italian campaigns, his eyes were opened to the futility and degenerative influences of war, and the unscrupulous "realpolitik" of the Papacy, and he returned to Glarus a convinced and vocal opponent of the whole mercenary system and of militarism generally.[3] His protest provoked the bitter reaction which is the fate of all protests against vested interests, and it was largely because of the hostility of the many pensionaries in Glarus that Zwingli moved to Einsiedeln.[4] The lesson of Glarus was not lost, however, for when he felt himself impelled at Zürich to make a wider protest against doctrinal and ecclesiastical scandals, he acted with no less vigour and courage, but with a greater practical wisdom and tactical skill. In the first years in Zürich Zwingli had few external advantages. He was a member neither of the Minster chapter nor of the town council,[5] and he had convinced opponents, especially in the Dominican order.[6] But like a wise pastor, he did not now rush ahead of his people. Indeed, he did not even press for specific reforms, but, exploiting his one advantage, as a regular preacher, he was content to give detailed and pointed instruction from Holy Scripture until the demand for reform came almost necessarily from below. Certainly, Zwingli himself inspired and directed the reforms which were eventually made. But he did so, not as a spiritual dictator, but as the adviser and conscience of an instructed people and council. In this way, opposition was overcome almost before it began, and a bond of confidence was maintained between pastor and people.

A final point is that Zwingli was ready to face not only the demands made upon others, but those made upon himself in his own moral and spiritual life. If he was a great pastor, it was partly because he was a great disciple. For example, there was the matter of his own Papal pension. He has sometimes been criticized for retaining it as long as he did. Yet he had earned the pension, which helped him to keep his library up to date,[7] and even in the first days of reform he was not plotting deliberately to overthrow the Papacy. Indeed, as late as 1523 the Popes would have been only too willing to retain his services.[8] But by this date Zwingli had already renounced the pension, for he had seen that its retention was morally incompatible with the course of evangelical reform on which he had now entered.[9]

But there was an even more inward problem which had arisen in

[1] Jackson, op. cit., pp. 344–56. [2] Farner, op. cit. II, pp. 73 f. [3] Ibid., II, pp. 172 f. [4] Ibid., II, pp. 208–9. [5] Prior to 1521. Cf. Jackson, op. cit., p. 151. [6] Ibid., pp. 144 f. [7] Farner, op. cit., II, p. 117. [8] Cf. B. J. Kidd, *Documents of the Continental Reformation*. 187. [9] Jackson, op. cit., p. 152; Farner, op. cit., II, p. 408.

the Glarus and Einsiedeln period. Like so many of his fellow-priests, Zwingli had found the burden of compulsory celibacy too heavy for him, He was not a profligate, but he had fallen short of absolute chastity.[1] At first, he had probably not given much thought to the matter. It was the custom of the age, and could be dealt with by dispensation and penance. But about 1516 a new sense of guilt arose with his deepening awareness of evangelical truth, which was not so purely intellectual as the textbooks suggest.[2] He did not overcome the temptation immediately: indeed, his appointment to Zürich was almost jeopardized by a final scandal.[3] But he did at least become aware of the temptation, and even prior to his marriage he gained the mastery over it. His pastoral rule was effective because it was based ultimately upon a personal rule.

And this was perhaps the real key to Zwingli's greatness. He had, of course, the qualifications without which he could not have done his work. He had the awareness of the contemporary relevance of the Gospel without which even his imposing qualifications would have fitted him only for a secondary role. But he had also an inward knowledge and apprehension which was at the heart of his greatest achievements. It was the conjunction of this apprehension with his gifts and vision which made of the popular parish priest of Glarus the equally popular but far more significant people's priest of Zürich.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

P. Burckhardt: *Huldreich Zwingli: eine Darstellung seiner Persönlichkeit und seines Lebenswerkes*. Zürich, 1918.
O. Farner: *Huldreich Zwingli*. Zürich, 1917 (transl. Lutterworth Press, 1952).
O. Farner: *Huldrych Zwingli*. 1943, 1946 (2 vols.).
G. Heer: *Ulrich Zwingli als Pfarrer in Glarus*, 1884.
S. M. Jackson: *Huldreich Zwingli*. London, 1901.
J. C. Mörikofer: *Ulrich Zwingli*. Leipzig, 1867, 1869 (2 vols.).
R. Stähelin: *Huldreich Zwingli*. Basel, 1895, 1897 (2 vols.).

G. W. Bromiley.

Episcopacy Misunderstood

If the furniture of a house grows old and becomes worm-eaten, it is thrown out, and new articles are obtained from the cabinet-maker; these may be made to imitate the pattern of the old just as much (or as little) as is judged to be useful and convenient. This figures crudely but not untruly a conception of "episcopacy" that is not uncommon. There must be, of course, some kind or other of ministry or pastorate, but no particular ministry is perceived as essential to the Church.

The Church of South India, which accepts "the historic episcopate in a constitutional form", declares explicitly that this "does not commit it to any particular interpretation of episcopacy".[4] Among "differing views and beliefs about episcopacy", it sets out two contrasted

[1] Farner, op. cit., II, pp. 140 f.
[2] Cf. Jackson, op.cit., p. 158.
[3] Farner, op. cit., II, pp. 295 f.
[4] Basis of Union, 9; Constitution, II, 11.

"interpretations". One of these resembles this "old furniture" conception: "Some regard episcopacy merely as a form of church government which has persisted in the Church throughout the centuries and may as such be called historic." On the other hand: "Others believe that episcopacy is of divine appointment, and that episcopal ordination is an essential guarantee of the sacraments of the Church."[1]

The root of the matter lies deeper than mere terminology and the fluid first-century use of pre-existing epithets such as *episkopoi* and *presbuteroi*.[2] Our Lord endowed the Household of the Church with a stewardship, and implied that his stewards—among whom some would be bad stewards—should endure until his coming again (Luke xii. 40–43). The apostles well understood themselves to be his stewards. (1 Cor. iv. 1, 2; Tit. i. 7).

No doubt the first apostles were especially witnesses of the Resurrection (cf. Acts i. 22); their authority as witnesses has blinded some people to their authority as stewards. "The function of these 'apostles' was to witness to the Resurrection, and, from the nature of the case, it was unique and unrepeatable."[3] It is forgotten that many others were witnesses besides Matthias and Joseph Barsabbas, who did not himelf become an apostle. "The Twelve had a special status conferred upon them by Christ, it was a personal thing and inalienable . . . it could not be transmitted."[4] "They could not send as they had been sent."[5] "An episcopal sort of apostleship (if we may so style it) is hard to detect in the New Testament."[6] So we are to understand that when the apostles had given their evidence, duly recorded in Scripture, their commission was exhausted; there could be no continuance of their stewardship. If this were truly the whole of their mission and authority, the stewardship must have died out in the first century—as indeed the Irvingites believed. But the stewardship of the first apostles, and of some secondary apostles, in the guidance and pastoral control of the Church (and of the "*presbuteroi-episkopoi*") is conspicuous in the Acts and Epistles; they taught, they ordained. For fifteen centuries no one imagined that this Stewardship had died out with the first generation. "Episcopacy" is only a bald and rather inexpressive name for it and for its continuance. The facts that Holy Scripture remains supreme in doctrine, and that apostolic or episcopal office can be lost by apostasy, have always been well recognized; they in no way exclude the continuance

[1] Basis of Union, 9. Many well-wishers of the Church of South India are troubled by difficulty in reconciling its Constitution with any interpretation of the latter type.

[2] Nor can the authority of Christ's apostle be safely measured by the legal status of the Jewish agent or envoy, the *shaliach*, any more than the office of a Christian *episkopos* can be measured by that of the Jewish *episkopos*, as at the building of the Temple in 2 Chron. 34. 12–17 and Neh. 11. 9, 14, 22 (Septuagint).

[3] *The Catholicity of Protestantism* (1950), p. 105.

[4] T. W. Manson, *The Church's Ministry* (1948), p. 51.

[5] P. T. Forsyth, *Lectures on the Church and Sacraments* (1917), p. 128.

[6] S. L. Greenslade in *The Ministry of the Church* (1947), p. 49.

of the stewardship, as has been argued.[1] Even of apostolic doctrine, the *paradosis*, the post-apostolic bishops were left the stewards, as St Irenaeus says.

Its endurance in continuity until now is an impressive fact that has naturally suggested expressions such as "a golden chain of ministry", or "a conduit-pipe down from the apostles". But figures of this kind suggest an independent life of an order of ministry *by itself*, apart from the Church as a whole. They do not accord well with the New Testament doctrine of the organic unity of the Church, figured by a physical body. A man's body, and his hand, are composed of cells entirely different from the cells that composed them in childhood. These have changed many times; but the organic succession of the hand has always been a function of the man's whole body. The hand has not been renewed and continued *by itself*, although it has always been a necessary medium of its own continuity. In the same way, the Body of the Church renews its membership generation after generation. The endurance of the stewardship of the Church in organic continuity can be truly understood as an organic function of the whole Body, even if it be seen to need the mediation of those ministers themselves who are its ministers of ordination. Accordingly it is truer to think and speak of the apostolic succession of the Church, rather than of its bishops considered apart, however necessary they may be to the Church in the fullness of its life, however indispensable as the organs by which the Church maintains its life in continuity. Those who have not seen the Stewardship of the Household as a divine endowment of the Church, who tend to think of "episcopacy" only as a matter of expedient organization, might better understand the nature of apostolic succession if it were more explicitly taught as the apostolic succession of the Church.

Even among firm believers in "episcopacy" and the apostolic ministry, there has sometimes been a tendency to isolate it in thought, as if it could exist apart from the Church. No matter how "essential" it may be, that is surely a faulty conception; just as heart or lungs could not be alive and vital apart from the body to which they are essential, so apart from the Household there cannot be a true Stewardship; so too without the organic life and sacraments of the whole Church a true episcopate could not endure. If (with a difficult effort) an "episcopate" could be imagined to have endured through the centuries in "legitimate succession", but without the faith of the Bible and Creeds, without the sacramental life of the whole Body, it could be no better than an antiquarian clique. It might claim to be a golden chain or a conduit-pipe; the familiar minimizing phrase "the historic episcopate" would be perfectly apt. Yet the gaunt sodality could have no real Christian meaning. Belief that a continuing and true apostolic ministry is necessary and integral to the Church does not imply that it is the sole essential, that, for example, the Bible could be an "extra". Even if such a "ministry" preserved Scripture and

[1] By J. P. Hickinbotham in *The Ministry of the Church*, pp. 37, 38.

Sacrament, it could not be the Christian Stewardship of the Household apart from the Household.

The Bible is essential—as every Christian from Rome to Tennessee would agree—yet it has never been an essential *by itself*. This can be tested by another imaginary supposition. Suppose that every Christian and all living Christianity had been blotted out by some cataclysm, perhaps when Jerusalem was obliterated in A.D. 135; suppose that no record was known beyond a brief Roman note that some agitator had been executed in a remote and troublesome corner of the Empire. (All this needs a violent effort of imagination,[1] for the civilization of to-day would be utterly different, and we should not be ourselves.) Suppose then, that a collection of very early documents has been found in a cave in Palestine (as actually occurred lately), but that this collection is comprised of all the documents, mostly anonymous, which we call the New Testament. That would be a tremendous discovery, for their unique greatness would shake the thinking world. Yet their interpretation would vary wildly with individual interpretation. The Brigham Youngs and Mrs Eddys might or might not gain large followings, but there would be nothing to set against them but the opinions of other people. All this is only a nightmare fancy; the New Testament is no foundling of unknown parentage. It is the recorded voice of the Christian Society. In one sense, it is true, the Church lived and grew for a generation and more without written record of its faith; actually Bible and Creed were in the womb of the Church from the very beginning, in the hearts and minds of those who had been with our incarnate Lord. The Church was the matrix of Bible and Creed, and, moreover, from the outset the Church was never without its appointed Stewardship. When Gnostic and other heretical "interpretations" of Scripture were put forward, the judgment of the early Church was virtually that "we have no such custom—or interpretation—neither the churches of God", and the agreement of the sub-apostolic bishops, the stewards of the *paradosis* was decisive.

These things suggest that real unity of the Church requires unity in all its riches, all its endowments, and that its continuing stewardship is one of these, the rejection of which must ever stand in the way of unity. Yet among very highly respected teachers of to-day there are some who hold a contrary opinion and make it the premiss of their reasoning. Some conclusions it leads them to seem mistaken; does this point to error in their premiss?

The essayists of *The Apostolic Ministry* (1946) aptly used the phrase "the essential ministry" to describe the nature of the apostolic episcopate, but *The Church's Ministry*, by Professor T. W. Manson (1948), although written in warmest charity, comes into head-on collision with its conception of "the essential ministry". The conflict is instructive. Dr Manson, after having twice stated the kernel of his argument in the following terms, ends with it as a "main thesis": [2]

[1] And it was never a possibility, Matt. 16. 18.
[2] Pp. 30, 31, 100.

> There is only one "essential ministry" in the Church, the perpetual ministry of the Risen and Ever-Present Lord himself. All other ministries are derivative, dependent, and functional.

With every word of that, when rightly understood, the essayist of *The Apostolic Ministry* would probably agree; but Dr Manson does not notice that he is at cross purposes with them. He has unwarily used the one word "ministry" in two different senses, i.e. (i) the spiritual operation of *ministering*, and (ii) a class or order of human *ministers* by which it is mediated. In the first sense, no Christian doubts that there is only one essential ministry, i.e. that we must look to our Risen Lord for all true operation and effect of *ministering*. Nor will any Christian doubt that the power and authority of all *ministers* must be, can only be, "derivative, dependent, and functional". But this ambiguous use of the word "ministry" does not help to solve the difficult problem which has been found so divisive—what *ministers* are truly "derivative"? That the stewards whom the Lord Himself appointed were truly so, none can doubt. If their departure did not leave the Household stewardless, it is surely reasonable to look upon those whom they appointed to follow them as also "derivative", and thus as essential ministers, dependent upon the divine Essential Ministry. That, at all events, was the settled belief of the Church for fifteen centuries.

It is now almost universally recognized, as the World Conference on Faith and Order declared in 1937, that "there is need of an ordained ministry recognized by all to act on behalf of the universal Church in the administration of the Sacraments". It must be asked, indeed, could any other way be contrived, in which the steward of to-day could be correlated with the stewards of the early Church, other than this "derivation"? What other stewardship could be recognized universally as truly "derivative"? No answer to this has ever been attempted. So a leading theologian who himself thinks that "we should be content in faith" to recognize the deliberate and solemn presentation to Christ, with prayer, by any congregation, adds regretfully that "mutual recognition of ministries seems theologically impossible".[1] Among writers who tend to underrate the need to preserve the organic continuity of the Church, some confusion of thought may sometimes be suspected. Thus the authors of *The Fulness of Christ* (1950) remark[2] that "What is essential to ordination is not succession from previously ordained ministers, but ordination by those who have authority to act on behalf of Christ and the Church." This supposed antithesis is all the stranger because, only on the previous page, they explain that it is exactly ordination that gives "authority to do things representatively".

The Reunion of the Church (1946) by Bishop J. Lesslie Newbigin, Bishop of Madura and Ramnad, is a noble exposition and defence of the scheme, inspired with the burning desire for Christian unity, which brought about the inauguration of the Church of South India in 1947. He accepts episcopacy with loyalty and firm conviction; it

[1] S. L. Greenslade in *The Ministry of the Church*, p. 60. [2] At p. 35.

"will offer a centre round which the Church may be visibly reunited", so long as it is "accepted and cherished as the organ of the Church's continuing unity".[1] Indeed, he writes of the apostolic ministry as a part of the continuous organic life of the body in eloquent words that recall much that was said in *The Apostolic Ministry*.[2] Nevertheless he seems, like the late Dr A. C. Headlam, to think that episcopacy, however expedient or necessary it may be for the promotion of Christian unity, is in principle institutional, "historic", not organic, not an essential endowment of the Church, as has been claimed. For a claim for episcopacy in such a sense, he says, it would have to be shown "that there was from the beginning a continuous chain of ministerial authority from the Apostles to the bishops *distinct from the unity and continuity of the Church as a whole*".[3] He seems to stop short of recognizing the Church's stewardship and its continuity as integral to the apostolic succession of the Church itself. Some conclusions follow that are difficult of acceptance. To show that "a principle of continuous succession in ministerial office operated in the Church from the beginning would support the Roman claim".[4] Moreover, he concludes, if a Church has repudiated the authority of the Pope "and has detached itself from the sections of Western Christianity which remained under his authority", it is obviously impossible for its members "to claim that the historical and institutional continuity of the Church as one body is of its *esse*".

Now some Churches that reject the claim of papal sovereignty have firmly retained the apostolic stewardship handed down in unbroken order, together with the full Catholic faith; all that apparently falls short of continuity with the Apostolic Church, without submission to the Roman obedience. The Old Catholic Churches, we must understand, lost that continuity when they rejected the papal sovereignty. This is *plus papiste que le Pape*, for Rome makes no such assertion, in spite of what it regards as schism or heresy. Bishop Newbigin does not say whether his theory extends to the Eastern Orthodox Churches; they finally rejected the papal claim of sovereignty in the eleventh century, although it is true that they had never freely and fully acknowledged it. (Churches have been grouped, and sometimes regrouped, under the presidency of metropolitans and patriarchs. That is a matter of organization, not a necessary part of the organic life of the Church. So also is the simple presidency or primacy accorded to the bishop or patriarch of Rome from early times.)

The author of *The Reunion of the Church* does not, of course, acknowledge the papal claim, and doubtless holds that it was an innovation upon the faith and order of the early Church. Therefore continuity, as he would seem to regard it, must have been destroyed by the *accretion* of the autocratic papal claim just as much as by its later rejection. So it seems logically to follow that the Roman Church also lost continuity at an early date. These conclusions are remarkable.

[1] Pp. 188, 189. [2] See esp. pp. 165, 166. [3] P. 152 (italics his). [4] P. 152.

At opposite extremes of outlook, the continuous apostolic ministry of the Church has sometimes been conceived of as if it could have an isolated life of its own, or, on the contrary, it is reckoned as only an "historic" accessory, not integral to the fullness of the Church. What is here suggested, with very great respect to those some of whose teachings have been referred to, is that either premiss leads to untenable conclusions, and that neither leads hopefully towards the unity for which all alike are yearning.

H. Burn-Murdoch.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Dr Werblowsky is Lector in Hebrew in the Department of Semitic Languages and Literatures, Leeds University.

The Rev. W. G. Addison is Vicar of Britford, Salisbury.

Dr Bromiley is Rector of St Thomas's Church, Edinburgh.

Dr Burn-Murdoch is the author of *Church, Continuity, and Unity*.

CORRESPONDENCE

SCOTTISH BY-PASS

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,

As one of the sons of Presbyterian parents who was confirmed in England and now (having managed to ascertain the appropriate body in Scotland) is a priest of the Episcopal Church, may I offer a few comments on Mr MacArthur's letter in your January number? It may be granted that there is more justification for the nickname of "the English Church" than some of our perfervid Scots will admit—though Mr MacArthur should remember that we are up against a long-established misrepresentation of our national history, about which (true or false) most Englishmen know nothing at all. But I cannot understand why the Episcopal Church "by her excess of zeal has obscured her position as part of the Anglican Communion". Has the Church of Ireland, or the Protestant Episcopal Church of America, obscured *her* position by the adoption of a national title? Could anyone imagine those provinces referring to themselves as "The Church of England in Ireland" or "in America"? Mr MacArthur himself says that on most of our church notice-boards in Scotland the words "C. of E." figure somewhere (not only, I may add, during the war but to this day). What more, I wonder, would he have us do?

The point about English public schools is well taken. It may not be generally known, either, that at each of the four Scottish universities there is an Anglican chaplain, either full- or part-time, and an Anglican Student society. These cater very largely for English students, but are closely connected with the life of their respective dioceses;

and they try to encourage the view that being an Anglican may be more than a matter of where you happen to have been born.

Scottish episcopalianism is so often represented as "the nigger in the woodpile" in conversations between the two Establishments, that I venture to add two remarks. First, the Church of England does not have a very proud record of friendship towards her smaller sister-Church, particularly during the eighteenth-century days of persecution. This is a time when she could amend, rather than aggravate, her previous injustices by refusing to set ecclesiastical snobbery above theological principle. The Dean of Chichester's words are timely in this respect.

Secondly, it may not be widely realized south of the Border that episcopacy as practised in Scotland is much more likely to commend itself to the wisest Presbyterians, with their traditional aversion to any kind of prelacy, than its Southern counterpart. Episcopacy in the Church of England to-day is redeemed by two things: the splendour of its traditions and the high personal quality of its bishops. But as a *system* it is absurd, and to ask anyone "to take it into their system" as it stands is to ask the unreasonable—you might as well ask them to take Westminster Abbey into their system. A Scottish bishop, on the other hand, is elected, and his powers in relation to the Synod and the Diocese are clearly laid down in the Canons of the Church: he normally acts (outwardly, at least) in concert with his brother bishops, not in the individualistic manner of English diocesans: and above all, his diocese is sufficiently small in numbers for him to be readily accessible to both clergy and laity and to have *some* opportunity of being a real Father in God to them. The long witness of the Episcopal Church in Scotland will not have been in vain if the representatives of the Church of England and the Church of Scotland remember these things when they are in conference.

Yours, etc.,

P. C. Rodger.

The Anglican Students Chaplaincy,
11, Chalmers Street,
Edinburgh, 3.

CHRISTIAN BURIAL

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,

I agree with "Inquirer's" criticisms of current abuses of the Burial Service and in particular his condemnation of a certain kind of funeral oration. But there is one instance where a short address is badly needed. Yet it is not often given. I refer to the case of the almost pagan family, attending a funeral at a crematorium, where, as they arrive, the next funeral can be seen approaching. They have little or no connexion with the Church. Their whole attention is concentrated on the grief of bereavement. The mere reading of the service does not gain their attention, nor does it redirect their thoughts.

At such a crucial moment in their lives much can be done by means of an informal address. Without it, unfortunately, the service will mean little and an opportunity to comfort and to convert is lost.

Yours very truly,
CONRAD MEYER.

DAWN,
HIGHERTOWN,
TRURO.

THE WELFARE STATE FROM A CHRISTIAN POINT OF VIEW

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

It seems to me that Mr Geoffrey Dobbs, in the letter which you publish in the February number, lays one hare by the heels only to start another. You admit that he is right in implying that men are not to be brought to love one another by legislation, and perhaps some suggestion that they can was to be read into your article in the December issue on the Welfare State. But having done so much, he appears to go on to lament that the Church of England is not like a young lady who makes herself up a different face for every admirer. Surely that "general faith of the Church of England", which he wishes to diagnose or assess, is illusory, and to blame the Church for this or that churchman's statements a mistake?

Presumably, however, the Church holds to certain dogmas, and, these being admitted, the real danger which your article may have exemplified is that a churchman shall mislead himself and others in the interpretation of one or more of them. There is, for instance, the dogma of Original Sin. I do not see how that is to be reconciled with the theory which you apparently advance, that the institution in England of the so-called Welfare State is a step in the direction of turning this wicked world into the Kingdom of God.

It is all very well for you to say modestly in your note to Mr Dobbs's letter that you claim no more than to give "*a* Christian point of view". Nobody disputes that the Church of England is exceedingly open-minded, that indeed she is catholic in a sense unsuspected by the Bishop of Monmouth or his Papist critics when he recently claimed that attribute for her. The other Sunday at Evensong in a village church we first sang a hymn according to which "heaven and earth shall pass away", and then another hymn according to which there is to be a "return to the Age of Gold"! You may tell me that there is nothing inconsistent in that, as the Age of Gold can return before heaven and earth pass away. But I beg leave to submit that one prediction is irreconcilable with the dogma of Original Sin, the other not.

I am dubious about the insistence on the justice alleged to be brought into existence by the Welfare State. From the fact that "social justice" is the current cant name for "soaking the rich" and trying to abolish the poor, it does not follow that the process actually is justice in any sense of the word. For instance, it cannot be justice

if in reality for the poor to be poor is just. To the large extent that the Welfare State is an outcome of the politics of human perfectibility, it is a denial of Original Sin. Hence not only has it little to do with Christianity, but it must be abhorrent to Christians. It may not be accidental that the steady accumulation of legislative measures of social assistance in this country has coincided with an equally steady decline in the strength and influence of the Church of England.

Apart from such considerations, the words used in your article to allege a connexion of the Welfare State with Christian charity are incomprehensible to me and possibly to others. The words are: "Justice is love operating at a distance." I venture to ask for their elucidation.

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,

MONTGOMERY BELGION.

WESTWOOD HOUSE,
PETERBOROUGH,
NORTHANTS.

[The expression "justice is love operating at a distance" (perhaps "indirectly" would be better) was intended to indicate what I took to be a now familiar view of the relation between love and justice: see, for example, Reinhold Niebuhr, *An Interpretation of Christian Ethics* (1936), or John Baillie, *What is Christian Civilization?* (2nd edition, 1947), pp. 67 ff.—A. R. V.]

BOOK REVIEWS

THE FULNESS OF TIME. By John Marsh. Nisbet. 15s.

Those familiar with the notable article on "Time" in Dr Alan Richardson's *Theological Wordbook of the Bible* will come to the author's full treatment of the subject with high expectations.

After laying bare his presuppositions, Professor Marsh begins with a word-study of the Hebrew and Greek terms, drawing out the now familiar contrast between a "realistic" and "chronological" understanding of time, expressed in the difference between *kairos* and *chronos*. This chapter does not add much to the material of the article. Indeed, for a major study of the Biblical doctrine of time it is really a little thin. No mention is made of the undoubted difference, and indeed conflict, between the prophetic and apocalyptic conceptions of time (the latter represented, for instance, in Daniel's "a time, times and half a time", and in the obsession with prediction). Nor does he attempt to assess the contribution of Ecclesiastes, which extraordinarily enough finds no place in his Scripture references, though it is the only book in the Bible consciously exercised by the *problem* of time. It would be significant to know how far he would accept the conclusions of Wheeler Robinson on this and other matters in the important discussion of time in his *Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament*. Again, one feels a passing reference at least might have been made to Rev. x. 6 ("there shall be time no longer"; RVM

"delay"), if only to correct the philosophical implications often drawn from it.

But it would be ungracious to labour such points. For the real and deep value of the book lies in its wider sweep.

It has two dominant motifs, which are viewed respectively as the clue to the Old Testament and the New. The first is the overarching significance of the Exodus, alike for affording the Hebrews the sense of history which imposed itself upon all their thinking and institutions, and as a "myth" of the End. The phrase "in that day" or "at that time" links the two great moments of Israelite existence—the day of deliverance and the day of the Lord—"between" which every decision was set. In this section Professor Marsh gives us an example of how exciting the Old Testament can be when imaginatively taught.

For the New Testament the key is the category of Fulfilment, "the instrument of interpretation by which alone any Jew of the first century could 'make sense' of the 'stuff of history' ". Yet "the Christian conviction is not that the future will fulfil the present and the past, but that one series of events in the past, the Life, Death, Resurrection, and Ascension of Jesus Christ, is itself the fulfilment of all history, past, present, and future alike." Professor Marsh goes on to relate this to the consequent "theological character of Gentile history" and to the doctrine of the End.

In the last two chapters he uses this concept of Fulfilment as the key to a Christian philosophy of history. He sees in "the fulness of time" the point at which eternity enters history (and thereby gives significance to every moment before or since) and the point at which man in time can enter eternity.

This section, which like the whole of the book is lucidly and suggestively argued, deserves to be studied very carefully. It is a serious attempt, while rejecting alike cyclical, spiral, and linear conceptions of time, to be both "reformed in theology and Platonist in philosophical method". It is questionable whether it succeeds. All talk of the relation of "eternity" and "time" (particularly the "intrusion" of eternity into time), as though they were separate entities, is, I believe, subtly unbiblical. The great genius of the Bible, as Cullmann points out, is that both in the O.T. (*olam*) and in the N.T. (*aion*) a single word covers both. I cannot believe that Platonism can ever hope to express this or give theological significance to duration as Divine. For all his historicism, Professor Marsh, by using the static category of an eternal "pattern" imposed on events (the phrase recurs constantly), is in grave danger of slipping into a new Hegelianism. For ultimately a *pattern* in events may be revealed at any time, and interpretatively, like a natural law, is related *in the same way* to what comes before and to what comes after it. But a *purpose* is tied to the irreversibility of time and can be fulfilled finally only *after* all that goes before. To suggest that, provided one is related in faith to the Fulfilment, to stand before or after Christ is merely of chronological and not of theological significance is to deny the *ephapax*, the irreplaceability, which Cullmann has stressed of each age in the economy

of God. Because Cullmann sees in the series of God's *kairoi* a temporal line of salvation it is not fair to say that he interprets history chronologically (i.e., in terms of *chronos*). And he has on his side the inexpungeable feeling for duration expressed in the Advent message, "Now is our salvation nearer than when we believed"—a note entirely lacking in Professor Marsh's treatment.

One reader at least still remains to be convinced that Plato and eschatology can really mix, or that A. E. Taylor and John Calvin are quite the bed-fellows they are here depicted. But this review is far more critical than it should be. Professor Marsh has had the courage to produce one of the first essays in Biblical philosophy since Barth. This is something that must be done, and which the Continent still declines to do. Here perhaps may lie the characteristically British contribution to theology in the next ten years. May this brave attempt receive the recognition, and stimulate the succession, which it so richly deserves.

Clare College, Cambridge. John A. T. Robinson.

A Critical Examination of von Hugel's Philosophy of Religion. By Albert A. Cock. Hugh Rees. 10s. 6d.

In undertaking a critical examination of the late Baron Freidrich von Hügel's religious philosophy, Professor Cock has essayed a task which all who, like himself and his present reviewer, treasure among their most precious possessions the memory of the intercourse which they were privileged to enjoy with that great mind and soul, must have often desired to see accomplished. The *Life* of the Baron by Count Michael de la Bedoyère, though excellent in many respects, has hardly attempted it; nor perhaps does the present volume, interesting and informative as it is, fulfil the promise of its title. It is not, for one thing, well constructed. After eight chapters, in which von Hügel's books are studied in the order of their publication, we reach "Conclusion", which is immediately followed by a ninth chapter, covering much of the same ground and in some cases verbally repeating passages included in the earlier part of the work; and this by an "appendix", which also seems to have been written in complete independence of the preceding sections. Nor, while it undoubtedly calls attention to some of the most important features of the Baron's teaching, does it anywhere present such a unified picture of it as, in the case of a thinker who never himself exhibited it as a systematic whole, one would have wished to find. The space now at my disposal will allow of only a few comments which have occurred to me during my reading of Prof. Cock's book, of which all students of von Hügel must certainly take account.

On p. 17 the permanently important contributions of the Baron to the philosophy of religion are classified under seven heads. My own classification would have been in some respects different. Perhaps I may be allowed to refer to an article published in the *Harvard Theological Review* for January, 1949. The first head in Prof.

Cock's enumeration is the well-known analysis in *The Mystical Element of Religion* of religion into its *institutional, intellectual,* and *mystical* factors. I have always thought that von Hügel did not attend sufficiently to the distinct character of that inward but *not* mystical type of piety whereof in our nation Bunyan, Wesley, and Cowper afford notable instances. This is by no means without representatives in the Roman Catholic Church (any more than Protestantism is lacking in genuine mystics), but it is perhaps more readily illustrated by Protestant examples. On the other hand, von Hügel, for all his profound study of mysticism, was not himself, in the strict sense of the word, a mystic. His passionate desire was not the characteristically mystical aspiration after *union* with God so much as the thirst for intercommunion with God as an objective Reality other than and transcending one's own "creaturely" self.

Another contention of von Hügel's which appears in Prof. Cock's list but not in mine is his defence of the traditional doctrine of the impassibility of God, to which is devoted one of the most striking of the second series of *Essays and Addresses.* My omission of it is, I must admit, due to the fact that, while profoundly impressed by the Baron's treatment of it, I never found it wholly satisfactory to my mind. The problem with which it is concerned is one of great theological importance, but also of great difficulty; and there is certainly here no room for a discussion of it. I will only observe that in von Hügel's decisive rejection of any kind of "patripassianism" he uses the phrase "the Unincarnate God" as if it were equivalent to "the Father"; that in such a statement as will be found in the concluding sentence of the late Prof. G. F. Stout's posthumously published *God and Nature,* this equation is avoided; and that it may well be the truth that in such a matter no adequate formula is attainable which will avoid an apparent contradiction and a real paradox.

With much of Prof. Cock's criticism of von Hügel's *Eternal Life* I find myself in agreement. Begun as an article for Hastings's *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics,* it does not, as it stands, give the reader what its title seems to promise; and the semblance of a history of the doctrine which it contains is too arbitrary in its selection of topics and too disproportionate in the attention paid to the various authorities mentioned to be more than a semblance. Von Hügel was indeed not one who could readily accommodate his thought to a prescribed pattern. But, as Prof. Cock would not wish to deny, the book is full of valuable things which no other writer could have given us.

On p. 58 Aristotle's God is described as a "spectator-God"; "self-contemplative" (as in *Essays and Addresses,* ii, 179) would be a more correct expression. On the same page it should have been noted that by "philosophy" Keats means what we nowadays generally call "science". On p. 63 the phrase "The abysmal depths of personality", from Tennyson's *Palace of Art,* seems to be attributed to Wordsworth; but perhaps this is not intended. On p. 110 Bergson's "Evolution Creatrix" should be either *Evolution Créatrice* or "Creative Evolution". Probably here it is the printer that is to blame. Prof. Cock has been ill-served by his printer; the book is full of bad mis-

prints, most of them, it is true, easily corrected; though the sentence beginning "Nothing is more central" on p. 154 is, as it stands, neither sense nor grammar. Worse printed of all is the brief index. But all who are interested in von Hügel will be grateful to the author for the survey of his teaching which this book contains.

CLEMENT C. J. WEBB.

THIS TURBULENT PRIEST. Charles Jenkinson: Parish Priest and Housing Reformer. By H. J. Hammerton. Lutterworth Press. 9s. 6d.

Established Churches tend to be conventional, and rebels against convention to find themselves ill-at-ease amidst the comforts of traditional Sion. Because of its long history and intimate association with the national life, this is particularly true of the Church of England. Notwithstanding, the first and most emphatic feature of Charles Jenkinson was that he was thoroughly at home within the Church of his baptism and ordination. From it he sought, not preferment, but the hardest jobs that could be found; and to it he brought an unswerving loyalty and devotion. He is of course best (and universally) known as the parish priest who conceived and carried out in Leeds the most remarkable scheme of slum-clearance and rebuilding of any British city. What is more remarkable is that, when he first went to Holbeck as vicar of a slum parish he had no previous connexions with the north of England; nor did he ever become other than a Cockney and southerner. Yet if ever new statues are added to that curious assortment in City Square, Charles Jenkinson will assuredly find his place by the side of W. F. Hook.

The Vicar of Hunslet is to be congratulated cordially on his achievement in presenting so succinct a picture of Jenkinson's work as housing reformer, and so faithful a portrait of the man and the priest, within the short compass of less than two hundred pages. Here the reader may learn full details of the rehousing of the slum population of Leeds; both the new housing estates, the Quarry Hill flats, the hotly-controverted principle of differential rents, and the astonishing mastery both of broad plans and minute detail which characterized Jenkinson's work. All this indeed is writ large in bricks and mortar in the city itself, where he who runs may read; but this sketch will explain it to those who have never penetrated beyond its railway stations.

More important perhaps than even this lucid and succinct account of Jenkinson's public work is the revelation of the source of its inspiration and of his personal religious life in the daily Eucharist and corporate life of an Anglican parish. I was privileged to count myself a friend of Jenkinson from his years at Ripon Hall, Oxford, to his death. He was one of the most remarkable men I have ever known. He was that *rara avis* an Anglican Catholic Modernist, whose devotion to the *ethos* of Catholicism was spontaneous, sincere, and natural; whilst at the same time his intellectual position was as

definitely and unequivocally Modernist. Moreover, he was a keen social reformer from the days of his association with Conrad Noel at Thaxted. His reading was surprisingly omnivorous; thanks to his indifference to sleep and his capacity for astonishingly rapid reading. Of course he was not a scholar; but few parish clergymen were more up to date in their theological studies. He was always eager for manual work; in all the churches which he served he left marks of his handiwork. I never suspected in him the latent capacity for conceiving broad schemes of housing estates, nor his absolute mastery of each detail. Before his institution to his slum parish in Holbeck, I was summoned by him to take Sunday duty whilst he looked round; and at once he told me that the only thing to do with the whole parish was to demolish it and build it anew. Mr Hammerton brings out Jenkinson's real genius for and love of parish work. He was no great preacher; his voice was high-pitched and squeaky; he shot far over the heads of his parishioners; but he worked as few men have worked within the compass of a single lifetime for the material and spiritual welfare of his people. It is impossible to conceive of Jenkinson as a dignitary; neither as bishop, nor dean, nor canon would he have been happy. Perhaps he should have been made "Archdeacon of All England"; for as such he would have grappled undauntedly with the problems of dilapidations and over-large parsonages.

Jenkinson died of cancer in his early sixties; after having spent himself unrestingly and unweariedly by day and night in the service of his people. He was completely honest, frank, straightforward, and absolutely indifferent to personal reward or position. His friendship was not a convenient or soothing thing; for he claimed the privilege of criticism as well as affection. He worked himself to death, in the literal sense of those words. To many who may have heard of his public work, of the violent controversies which it aroused, and of his indefatigable energy, this volume, an act of *pietas*, will reveal the man and the hidden springs of his life and work. For at bottom he was one of the holy and humble men of heart, whose lives bless the Lord and in whose lives multitudes of their brethren rise up to call them blessed.

CAMBRIDGE. NORMAN SYKES.

THE TREE OF LIFE AND OTHER VERSES. By Nathaniel Micklem. Oxford University Press. 7s. 6d.

Those who may not normally be interested in what goes for modern poetry can be assured that this at least is well worth reading. Here is no slipshod workmanship, ill-digested thought, and the utter disregard for tradition that impoverishes so much that goes by that name. Here rather are a number of poems written in strict, but easy flowing, Spenserian stanzas, whose nature can best be described as that of a quiet meditation, question and answer. Must not reason necessarily be supplemented by revelation in man's search for truth? they seem to ask. Not that there need be any fundamental antagonism between the two, for throughout the ages the truly wise, nay Duns

Scotus himself, had most strongly recognized this, and the human heart has ever cried out for more satisfaction than the answer of the human reason alone can give. The mind must but retain its humility before the secrets of the universe, and the heart its receptivity, and to such will be given those fleeting moments of divine illumination when he sees into the inner loveliness of the earth so touched with this celestial fire. It may be in the most commonplace of nature, in grass blades caught by the sun and spangled by the dew, in muddy pools in the wintry fields, in trees—moments when his heart will be moved to adoration even as the ancient botanist Linnaeus, who, on landing on these sunlit shores, fell on his face in wonder. The pagan in his dim gropings after the Ineffable, in the Yggdrasil Ash, the Tree of Life, had but worshipped what he did not understand, but recognized as divine; and so too have the poets and makers of myth of old comprehended a secret which, alas, in these days of modern analytical science we tend too easily to lose. Surely, however, while rejecting the old pagan gods of the tree, we can still worship and revere it all the more, this time in and for itself, as the very expression of the Mind of the Creator?

These poems are thoughtful, scholarly, impersonal, and yet deeply sincere—qualities all that we might expect from such an author. Some may find them a little didactic in places, too long-drawn out in others, and perhaps lacking in that fire and energy which come only with impassioned thought. For this reason the few poems written in free verse are less good, whilst the few sonnets seem better suited to Dr Micklem's style. Others again may find various echoes, from Clough to Walter de la Mare, but personally I find these so assimilated to the writer's thought as rather to contribute to the general enrichment of the whole. Above all there are some lovely descriptive lines, as when

> "On a day of sunlit spring
> The wilds of Putney Heath were all aflame
> With gorse in splendour of its blossoming,
> When young Linnaeus first to England came."

I think we could do with more of this, and less abstract argument, but perhaps this is a matter of taste, and the readers of THEOLOGY may prefer the balance the way the author has given it. These poems contain the fruit of Dr Micklem's thought, and "grow" upon one as one rereads.

OXFORD. MARY HAMPDEN-JACKSON.

A HISTORY OF AUTOBIOGRAPHY IN ANTIQUITY (2 vols.). By Georg Misch; translated in collaboration with the author by E. W. Dickes. Routledge and Kegan Paul. 42s.

This is an impressive, a monumental work. It is hardly to be expected that many readers of THEOLOGY will be prepared, or leisured enough, to read it from cover to cover. But almost all of them would

be likely to find, especially in the second of these volumes, which culminates in a detailed study of St Augustine's *Confessions*, a great deal that will interest and reward them and is not addressed only to the more "curious reader".

The essence of autobiography, as Prof. Misch understands and expounds it, lies not so much in chronological or factual recording of a life-story at first hand, but rather in a man's deliberate attempt to achieve self-awareness by writing and to gather in the fruits of his own experience, casting his reflections into *any* form that literary precedent may suggest or his own ingenuity may invent. Hence a variety and abundance of autobiographical material drawn from all manner of sources. By linking all this together in a wide perspective with masterly skill the author traces the gradual changes in the climate and content of the inner life through the centuries, and the concomitant development of autobiographical writing from cramped and hybrid origins into a mature and independent literary *genre*.

In this short space it is hardly possible to do more than mention and underline a few of the great or noteworthy names among the ancients, pagan or Christian, who figure in this work and can easily be looked up by referring to the thoroughly satisfactory index. Special attention may be drawn to the following: an intriguing cameo of Heraclitus; a careful examination of Plato's "Seventh Epistle", which is an elaborate apologia (now presumed to be authentic) dealing with his ill-fated experiment in practical politics at the court of Dionysius II; the Cicero revealed so intimately in the long series of letters to Atticus and others, as distinct from the Cicero depicted in his various self-adulatory writings; an appraisal of Seneca's *Moral Epistles*, considered as a personal testament for the edification of a degenerate age; an engagingly sympathetic study of that *anima naturaliter Christiana*, Epictetus; a full-length portrait of Marcus Aurelius; a discussion of Plotinus' contribution to the discovery of spiritual individuality; a startlingly controversial vindication of Nestorius, who "regarded himself as a consistent champion of orthodoxy, as indeed he was"; a chapter on Gregory of Nazianzus, whose eloquent outpourings in verse and prose record his own vicissitudes and aspirations and include a moving account of his clash with Arianism at Constantinople; a full and able exposition of St Augustine's progressive self-revelation—in the *Soliloquies*, in the *Confessions*, and finally in the *Retractationes*, that unique testament in which a giant of the pen dispassionately surveys his own prodigious output; and, in the epilogue, some pages dealing with Paulinus of Pella, St Patrick, and Boethius.

Of this English edition it is enough to say that, although by far the greater part of the text is a translation from the German, one is seldom made conscious of the fact. A continuation of this *History of Autobiography* down to the seventeenth century has been promised, and its publication will be awaited by not a few English readers as a literary event of some importance.

Blandford St Mary. Hugh Buss.

SHORTER NOTICES

THE HIERARCHY OF HEAVEN AND EARTH. By D. E. Harding. With a foreword by C. S. Lewis. Faber. 21s.

Scientific thought has not only to contend with its own domestic problems: it must also come to terms with the wider range of experience. Many writers have addressed themselves to the questions raised by the influence of science in other fields, and there has not been lacking a stream of books of the type "Science and . . . ". Fewer thinkers have tackled the deeper problem of the nature of the pattern in which the sciences and the arts, societies, and individuals, good and evil, form a *uni*-verse. Mr Harding's book is an entertaining essay on this point.

Dr C. S. Lewis points out in his foreword that the book attempts to reverse a movement of thought which has been going on since the beginning of philosophy. This movement empties the observed world of all life and qualities and finally throws doubt on the mind which is presumed to contain concepts, images, or even statistics. The observer himself becomes the last casualty in the process of reducing everything to abstraction. Mr Harding's method of reversal appears to require two things: a starting-point and an assumed view of the universe. The starting-point is the observer. Mr Harding interrogates his methods of apprehending the outer world and goes on to put him as a man into the larger setting of his universe, interpreted as living organism: divided roughly into sub-human, human, and supra-human levels. The pattern is akin to that of traditional Christian theology and poetry, with a dash of A. N. Whitehead (prehensive unification) and General Smuts (Holism). Mr Harding has also dared to borrow the old notion of Man as the microcosm, which reigned from the Pythagoreans to the Alchemists. The result is an extremely imaginative and stimulating essay in perspective.

How successful Mr Harding has been is another matter. It is perhaps too big a book to be so untechnical in the philosophical sense, and many will be irritated by a good deal of repetition. For all this, the work sparkles with aphorisms: "The most important astronomical fact is astronomy"; "In winning nature over from the supernatural, science has neglected nothing—nothing except the most revealing of all natural functions, namely itself"; "Not new facts, but a change of viewpoint, is all that is now needed to reveal to us in its magnificence the sacramental universe that satisfies head no less than heart". To the achievement of this change of viewpoint, Mr Harding has made a creative contribution.

ROCHESTER. D. R. VICARY.

THE CHURCHMAN'S HERITAGE. By E. G. Knapp-Fisher. A. and C. Black. 6s.

This book is distinguished by a wealth of quotations, apposite, weighty, and charming, from the great Anglican divines of the six-

teenth and seventeenth centuries, which its author, who is clearly steeped in their writings, describes as "the normative age in the history of our Church". That may perhaps be conceded, and yet it may still be doubted whether the ingredients that have gone to the making of our heritage are not more varied, more providentially disconcerting, and some of them more contemporary than might be gathered from a perusal of these pages. The Church of England is a more exciting, less demure, and therefore more hopeful thing than its apologists are apt to make it. Tension, and not only moderation, is in its life-blood. Yet it is well that the moderation which the Principal of Cuddesdon sees as the central constituent of that "Ethos of the English Church" of which his book is a study should be spoken up for. It has lately been a fashionable affectation to despise it. Here is said what a large part of the general body at least of the clergy would wish to say and they are apt to be missing from the Church of England's presentation of itself to the world, including the ecclesiastical world, because they are not vociferous. Discussions of the nature of the Church of England, Establishment, Ministry (this, had we been nurtured in a non-episcopal body, we might think a little question-begging), Liturgy, and Authority, are concluded by an excellent chapter on Vocation. The book is one which the Vicar might well be glad to put into the hands of such of his church officials as go in for reading. But many to whom it will seem to tell an old story, and some who may find parts of that story not entirely convincing, will find themselves deeply refreshed by that older High Church fountain from which the author has drawn the best of this draught. Is he perhaps, in the construction which he puts on the "Ecclesia anglicana libera sit" of Magna Carta, seeing that document a little through such seventeenth-century eyes?

WIGAN. FRANK BENNETT.

THE PROPHETIC FAITH OF OUR FATHERS. Volume I. By L. E. Froom. Review and Herald, Washington, D.C. $5.00.

This splendidly printed and illustrated and well-documented book of over 1,000 pages is Volume I of what will be, when it is finished in four volumes, a history of the last 2,000 years from the standpoint of the Seventh Day Adventists.

These 1,000 pages take us nearly to the Reformation. They are at least timely, for eschatology is "in the air" again to-day with a vengeance, and Daniel and Revelation are in the Canon. Furthermore, Christian hope is in manifestly short supply, and if the Church fails to grapple with the eschatological question, then the situation is wide open, and if the Adventists do not exploit it, the Marxists and Mau-Mau will.

If the Scriptural exegesis of this volume seems to us perverse and its medieval by-ways fantastic, nevertheless sacrifice and co-operation have gone to its production and these may well make us pause before we lightly condemn.

TRURO. J. E. FISON.

THE RELIABILITY OF THE GOSPELS. By A. J. B. Higgins. Independent Press, Ltd. 3s.

Dr A. J. B. Higgins is well known for his research into the Arabic text of the Diatessaron of Tatian. Here he wears his learning lightly, giving the briefest possible account of (1) the historicity of the Gospel narratives and (2) the relevance of the Old Testament to them. In (1) he discusses the nature of the Gospels as religious documents; the text of the Gospels, with a bare outline of the history of textual criticism; the Evangelists and their sources where he takes the evidence of Papias and that for the existence of Q more seriously than do some neo-Catholic critics; Proto-Luke, where the arguments in favour of the theory are summarized but not those of a Creed or Goguel against it; the value of the sources of the Gospels and in discussing the period of oral transmission, Form criticism, where he rightly criticizes the speculative nature of Form critics' work, though generously and rather vaguely he allows that their method "brings us nearer not only to the first Christians but to the historical Jesus". Can such generosity really be extended to a Bultmann and in C. C. McCown's phrase to "other Formgeschichtler walking in goose-step" after him? A page on miracles, especially that of the Resurrection, concludes the first lecture. In (2) he discusses the use by Jesus of the Old Testament and then gives brief notes on him as "Christ", "Son of David", "Son of God", "the Servant", "Son of Man", "Lord". If a parish priest of forty years' experience was right in remarking recently that the average semi-educated parishioner is inclined to dismiss the Gospel stories as though they were legends, then this is the kind of book to put into such a parishioner's hands. Others who consider themselves better educated but have been led astray by the terms "Mythus" or "Legenda" of certain Form-critics would also profit by it, short and simple as it is.

C. S. C. WILLIAMS.

MERTON COLLEGE,
OXFORD.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES: THE GREEK TEXT WITH INTRODUCTION AND COMMENTARY. By F. F. Bruce. Tyndale Press. 25s.

It is now twenty years since the last volume of *The Beginnings of Christianity* was published, and the appearance of a new commentary on Acts, on a smaller scale but incorporating much of the valuable material accumulated in that giant work, has long been overdue. Mr Bruce's book is likely to prove of great assistance to serious students, in that he provides a balanced and scholarly verse by verse commentary on the Greek text, drawing largely—as all future commentators must do—on the work of Foakes-Jackson and Lake and their collaborators, but adding much independent information and writing from a much more conservative point of view. His comments are particularly helpful in drawing attention to the linguistic ranges and textual problems of the book.

Mr Bruce accepts the Lucan authorship of Acts, and here the great

majority of critical opinion in England will agree with him. He also argues for the very early date of the book, *c.* A.D. 62, although here many scholars will not be convinced that he has given enough weight to the evidence which places the composition of Mark after that date. There is a full and interesting discussion of the relationship of the two forms of text with each other, and Mr Bruce's conclusion is that while the "Neutral" text is prior to the "Western", much more must still be done before the problem of the early transmission of the text of Acts can be solved.

†R. G. Heard.

Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible. Fascicules XXIV–XXV. Edited by Pirot et Robert. Letouzey et Âné.

This learned and extremely up-to-date Supplement continues to appear in roughly annual parts. It is the despair of the reviewer, since every seventh article achieves the dimension of a large theological tome. Fascicule XXIV contains an article by P. Henry on *Kenosis*, which if not precisely typical, gives some indication of the scope and quality of the work. In a study which covers 75 quarto pages in close double column, the author, after a meticulous examination of the text of Phil. 2. 6–11 phrase by phrase and often word by word, relates the passage to the similar texts in the Pauline corpus and to parallels in pagan history and mythology and in Gnostic writings. He finds the chief source in the Servant passages in Isaiah, in particular 42, 13–53, 12, which is in turn subjected to a rigorous survey. He then passes in review all the Fathers *seriatim*, quoting difficult or ambiguous texts in full, reaching the conclusion that for Christian antiquity the Kenotic theory was *absolument impensable* (col. 136). The modern theory of Kenosis is then illustrated in Lutheran, Anglican (Gore and Weston), and Orthodox (Bulgakov) dress, and a conclusion, sensitive to its creditable aims as well as its deficiencies, is drawn, albeit in an unfavourable sense. A very full and up-to-date bibliography is appended.

Similar treatment in documentation and analysis is given to the word *Kyrios* by L. Cerfaux in the same fascicule, and to *Logos* in fascicule XXV by various authors in an article of 75 columns. In both the extra-Biblical as well as the Biblical usage of each word is examined. Another article of special interest to Anglicans is a study by Courtade of Papal Encyclicals dealing with the Bible and Biblical studies, tracing the gradual approach to a more liberal (if not Liberal!) position, of which Pius XII's address to the Society of O.T. Studies, meeting last Easter in Rome, was a striking indication.

An article of a different type is given to the *Lithostroton* or Pavement of John 19. 13 and to the results of recent excavation on the site of the Court of Antonia.

Altogether one could wish that a modern Dictionary of the Bible such as this were available for the English reader.

G. E. P. Cox.

Liverpool.

SCIENCE IS A SACRED COW. By Anthony Standen. Sheed and Ward. 10s. 6d.

This is a curious book. It is a long tirade against science, or rather against the crude worship of science (the "sacred cow") by silly and ignorant people in America. It could hardly have been written in England, where nobody takes much notice of science. The author, a scientist of some standing, also seizes the opportunity to let fly at various other well-meaning persons, such as teachers of English literature. It would perhaps be worth while giving the book to a science-crazed sixth form boy, though the violence of the attack might merely reinforce his addiction.

EXETER. K. G. COLLIER.

THE HOPE OF GLORY. By Martin Jarrett-Kerr, C.R. S.C.M. Press. 8s. 6d.

The sub-title of this small but very valuable book is "The Atonement in our Time". Fr Jarrett-Kerr is known to the discriminating reader of periodicals as a lively thinker with a most effective style. He is a modernist in the sense that Thomas Aquinas was a modernist and Bishop Barnes is indisputably not one. That is to say, he endeavours to relate the faith delivered to us to the contemporary climate of opinion. Recent judgments on the subject of Personality by American psychologists and the work of the Existentialist philosophers are all grist to the mill. Fr Jarrett-Kerr has been impressed by the quantity of good books on the Atonement which emanate from Protestant circles in our time and the dearth of good Catholic writing on the same subject. After a consideration of man's condition, in particular his limitedness and sinfulness—"limitedness for which he is not responsible and which he yet resents, and sinfulness for which he is to blame and which he yet tries to excuse"—it is perceived that man's awareness of this condition is what differentiates him from other species.

The God who responds to man's need and the manner of that response are then reviewed and a chapter on the nature of the reconciliation achieved, i.e. the at-oneing of Man with God follows, and the book concludes with a very stimulating essay on "Redeeming the Time". Here it is demonstrated that the apparent neglect of the Atonement by Catholics is misleading because it is in the Eucharist and the Church that the Atonement is in fact operative. Protestants can easily become epistemological about soteriology, while the Catholic approach is ontological (i.e. concern with "being saved" rather than with knowledge of salvation). For Catholics it is impossible to divorce the study of the Atonement from the fact of incorporation into the Body of Christ. Great use is made of recent books on the Sacrifice of the Mass by Canon Masure that go far to remove old misunderstandings in the minds of Protestants.

The author very modestly suggests that he is not a theologian: he is certainly a most able apologist, for this is apologetic at the highest

level. The use of "Moi" and "Soi" taken from Nédoncelle might be reinforced by the interesting theory of the "I" and the "Me" in Meade *Mind, Self, and Society*, a book which is not mentioned. One would like to know what Fr Jarrett-Kerr would think of it.

If one must criticize, this is too small a book to be so closely packed with new ideas, abundant quotation, and lively debate. It is perhaps prolegomena to a book which one looks forward to seeing from the pen of the author in the future. Certainly an approach to Christology in the light of the most recent work in psychology parallel to Fr Thornton's use of the philosophy of organism is a real challenge to the theologians.

BANGALORE. LEONARD M. SCHIFF.

THE WESTERN LITURGY AND ITS HISTORY. By Theodor Klauser, translated into English by F. L. Cross. Mowbrays. 4s.

A convenient summary of continental research during the past forty years, much of it not easily accessible to English students. The author is aware of implications for the current Roman Use.

G. J. CUMING.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ALLEN AND UNWIN: R. W. Church, *An Analysis of Resemblance* (12s. 6d.); Sir Aylmer Firebrace, *If Thou Criest after Knowledge* (25s.).

BLACKWELL: H. H. Rowley, *The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (16s.).

BRITISH BROADCASTING CORPORATION: E. W. Williamson, *Henry Vaughan* (1s.).

EDINBURGH HOUSE PRESS: R. O. Hall, *Hong Kong: What of the Church?* (1s.); Allen Birtwhistle, *Revolution* (3s. 6d.).

EPWORTH PRESS: *Why I Believe* [Personal testimonies broadcast on the Scottish Home Service in 1951] (5s.); T. Francis Glasson, *His Appearing and His Kingdom* (16s.).

FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION: E. L. Allen, *Neglected Factors in the East-West Conflict* (1s.); G. M. Jeffery, *South Africa: Fellowship or Fear?* (6d.).

LONGMANS: C. F. Kelley, *The Spirit of Love* (21s.).

NELSON: *An Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the Old Testament* (5s.).

PUBLICATIONS UNIVERSITAIRES DE LOUVAIN: André Hayen, S.J., *Saint Thomas d'Aquin et la vie de l'Église* (Fr. 48).

S.C.M. PRESS: S. L. Greenslade, *Schism in the Early Church* (21s.); David M. Paton, *Christian Missions and the Judgment of God* (6s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: E. Giles, *Documents Illustrating Papal Authority* A.D. *96–454* (17s. 6d.); Millicent Price, *"Inasmuch as . . ."* (*The Story of Sister Dora of Walsall*) (5s.); Laurence E. Browne, *Ezekiel and Alexander* (3s. 6d.).

ZWINGLI-VERLAG (ZÜRICH): Mathias Rissi, *Zeit und Geschichte in der Offenbarung des Johannes* (Fr. 13.50); Joachim Jeremias, *Die Gleichnisse Jesu* (Fr. 9.70).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher